

EXHIBIT A

Jennifer Nigro

From: Jennifer Nigro
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 12:00 PM
To: 'Krishnan Chittur'
Cc: Robert Lillienstein; astrutinskiy@chittur.com
Subject: RE: Serin v. Northern Leasing

Krishnan: I cannot respond to this letter until you let us know one way or the other whether Plaintiffs will withdraw their motion to compel. Either we continue to meet and confer -- or Defendants file their opposition to Plaintiffs' motion. We are not going to do both. Your motion derailed the meet and confer, and failed to comply with Rule 37.2. I will ask you one more time if you intend to withdraw the motion in order to comply with the Local Rules and to demonstrate your commitment to resolving discovery issues in good faith. I cannot continue to indulge you in this back-and-forth - it's not productive.

Regards,

Jen Nigro

From: Krishnan Chittur [mailto:kchittur@chittur.com]
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 10:53 AM
To: Jennifer Nigro
Cc: Robert Lillienstein; astrutinskiy@chittur.com
Subject: Re: Serin v. Northern Leasing

Pl see attached. - *see Exh. A-1*

On Thu, Mar 25, 2010 at 4:52 PM, Jennifer Nigro <jnigro@mosessinger.com> wrote:
Krishnan: please respond to my two questions:

1. Do plaintiffs intend to withdraw their motion in light of Local Rule 37.2
2. Can you please provide alternate dates for plaintiffs' respective depositions

I don't see anything in the order that requires one side to be deposed before the other.

Please let me know your answer -- yes or no -- to the above inquiries so that we may proceed accordingly.

Regards,

Jen Nigro

From: Krishnan Chittur [mailto:kchittur@chittur.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 4:20 PM
To: Jennifer Nigro
Cc: Robert Lillienstein; astrutinskiy@chittur.com

4/2/2010

Subject: Re: Serin v. Northern Leasing

Jennifer:

The "meet and confer" was over on February 25, a month ago. You have not yet agreed to or even suggested revisions to the stipulation and order which was submitted to you based upon your own email several days ago, and have simply ignored our reminders. If Defendants are agreeable to producing additional items which are the subject of our letter, you just have to say so and that issue is moot. We are not interested in endless "meet and confers", as has happened - and is happening - in Gagasoules with respect to Defendant's production in response to the first document request served over a year ago.

Defendants have not yet produced the documents which you agreed to a month ago. Nevertheless, you demand specific dates for Plaintiffs' depositions? As you said, "first things first." We need to get Defendants' documents, and depose Defendants first; all our discovery notices were issued much before Defendants. Once those issues are addressed, we can provide dates for plaintiffs' depositions.

You may consider our letter request amended to seek a conference as a prelude to the order sought. Nevertheless, the discovery disputes remain and need to be resolved first.

I suggested a conference only to avoid further delay and avoidable waste of resources for both sides - the case is scheduled for trial in September.

Yours truly,
K. Chittur, Esq.
Chittur & Associates, P.C.
286 Madison Avenue Suite 1100
New York, New York 10017
Tel: (212) 370-0447

P.S. This email may contain confidential and/or privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply email and delete all copies of this message

On Thu, Mar 25, 2010 at 3:39 PM, Jennifer Nigro <jnigro@mosessinger.com> wrote:

Krishnan: the appropriate course of action would be for plaintiffs to withdraw their motion, without prejudice; otherwise, plaintiffs are blatantly disregarding Rule 37.2. We are in the middle of a meet and confer, and we should endeavor to resolve the outstanding issues by a date certain. If there are still issues that we cannot resolve after that date, plaintiffs can request a pre-motion conference with Judge Gwin per Rule 37.2. Please let me know if plaintiffs intend to withdraw their motion, without prejudice, in light of Rule 37.2.

Also, I never heard from you or Mr. Strutinskiy on the issue of alternate dates for plaintiffs' respective depositions in light of your request for an additional 4 weeks to respond to defendants' discovery demands -- which were due on March 12th. Per my email to Mr. Strutinskiy, defendants are willing to extend plaintiffs' time to produce documents provided that counsel provide a list of dates on which each plaintiff will be available for deposition in New York, so that we may re-notice them accordingly. Mr. Strutinskiy said he would follow up -- but we have not received any information since then. Can you or Mr. Strutinskiy please provide us with alternate dates on which each plaintiff is available for deposition in New York.

Regards,

4/2/2010

Jen Nigro

From: Jennifer Nigro
Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2010 10:08 PM
To: 'kchittur@chittur.com'
Cc: Robert Lillienstein; 'astrutinskiy@chittur.com'

Subject: Re: Serin v. Northern Leasing

Thank you for the response. Tomorrow may be difficult for me in terms of scheduling. Perhaps the appropriate thing to do would be to send a joint request for a teleconference to Judge Gwin tomorrow and follow up with his clerk re: the Judge's schedule. Let me confer with Rob Lillienstein on his schedule as well as he may want to be on the call.

Regards,

Jen Nigro

From: Krishnan Chittur
To: Jennifer Nigro
Cc: Robert Lillienstein; Andrey Strutinskiy
Sent: Wed Mar 24 21:27:33 2010
Subject: Re: Serin v. Northern Leasing

Jennifer:

I had overlooked your second point. I'm amenable to a conference with the judge on the issues raised in our letter. That would also avoid both sides having to spend time and energy on additional briefing. If you're agreeable, we can find out the court's convenience for a conference tomorrow.

Yours truly,
K. Chittur, Esq.
Chittur & Associates, P.C.
286 Madison Avenue Suite 1100
New York, New York 10017
Tel: (212) 370-0447

P.S. This email may contain confidential and/or privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply email and delete all copies of this message

On Thu, Mar 18, 2010 at 6:30 PM, Jennifer Nigro <jnigro@mosessinger.com> wrote:

Krishnan: we are in receipt of Plaintiff's letter motion dated March 16th, which I understand was filed via ECF today. Two things -- we'd like to request additional time to respond to the motion -- specifically, on or before April 2nd. Second, I believe that the local rules for the SDNY -- 37.2 -- require the movant to request a conference with the judge before making any motions under FRCP 26 - 37 inclusive. Please let me know what you'd like to do with respect to the latter issue.

Regards,

4/2/2010

Jen Nigro

MOSIES & SINGER LLP

COUNSELORS AT LAW

[website](#) [vCard](#) [bio](#) [map](#) [email](#)

JENNIFER NIGRO | 212.554.7808

The Chrysler Building | 405 Lexington Avenue | New York, NY 10174-1299

Tel 212.554.7800 | Fax 212.554.7700

MSI Global Alliance is an international alliance of independent legal and accounting firms, with over 250 member firms in 100 countries.



IRS CIRCULAR 230 DISCLOSURE:

To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

This message is being sent from a Law Firm and may contain CONFIDENTIAL or PRIVILEGED information. If you are not the intended recipient, do not printout, copy or distribute this message or any attachments. Advise the sender immediately by reply e-mail, and delete this message and attachments without retaining a copy.

--

--

--

Yours truly,
K. Chittur, Esq.
Chittur & Associates, P.C.
286 Madison Avenue Suite 1100
New York, New York 10017
Tel: (212) 370-0447

P.S. This email may contain confidential and/or privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply email and delete all copies of this message

4/2/2010

EXHIBIT A-1

Chittur & Associates, P.C.

Attorneys & Counselors at law
286 Madison Avenue Suite 1100
New York, New York 10017
Tel: (212) 370-0447
Fax: (212) 370-0465
Web: www.chittur.com
Email: kchittur@chittur.com

March 29, 2010

Jennifer Nigro, Esq.
Attorney at law
Moses & Singer
Chrysler Building
405 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10174-1299

Re: Serin v. Northern Leasing

Dear Ms. Nigro:

On February 25, 2010, you agreed to supplement Defendants' document production in certain respects. However, as of today, you have neither done so nor responded to the draft Stipulation and Order which we sent you about a fortnight ago. You have also not responded to our repeated reminders in this regard. Please let us have your responses to the following issues:

1. Do you intend to sign the Stipulation and Order? If so, when?
2. Do you intend to live upto your agreement of February 25, 2010, to produce additional documents? If so, when?
3. Would you please provide alternative dates for each defendant's deposition?

If you have any questions, please call me. Thank you very much.

Yours very truly,

Sd/-

Krishnan S. Chittur, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs